OIPE
OCT 06 2008
PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

Our Docket No.: 42P6482D

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

In re Application of:	)	
	)	
Goldschmidt Iki et al.	)	Examiner: Raman, Usha.
	)	
Application No.: 09/779,779	)	Art Group: 2623
	)	
Filed: February 8, 2001	)	
	)	
For: Method and Apparatus for Selecting from Multiple Versions of an Entertainment Program	)	

Mail Stop: Appeal Brief - Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

APPEAL BRIEF
IN SUPPORT OF APPELLANT'S APPEAL
TO THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Sir:

Applicant (hereinafter "Appellant") hereby initiates a new appeal in response to the Examiner's reopening of prosecution in an Office action mailed August 27, 2008. A Notice of Appeal is submitted together with this Appeal Brief (hereinafter "Brief"). Appellant respectfully requests consideration of this appeal by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (hereinafter "Board") for allowance of the above-captioned patent application.

An oral hearing is not desired.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The invention is assigned to Intel Corporation of 2200 Mission College Boulevard, Santa Clara, California 95052.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

To the best of Appellant's knowledge, there are no appeals or interferences related to the present appeal that will directly affect, be directly affected by, or have a bearing on the Board's decision.

III. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-5, 7-19, and 21-26 are currently pending in the above-referenced application. Claims 6 and 20 have been canceled. No claims have been allowed. All pending claims were rejected in the Office Action mailed August 27, 2008, and are the subject of this appeal.

Claims 1-5, 9-19, 21, 22 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

In response to the Office action mailed on August 27, 2008, rejecting claims 1-5, 7-19, and 21-26, no amendments were offered. Instead, Appellant has filed this Appeal Brief and accompanying Notice of Appeal.

A copy of all claims on appeal is attached hereto as Appendix A.

V. SUMMARY OF THE CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

The following paragraph from page 3, lines 5-13 of the originally filed specification is believed to be instructive in considering the present application.

"One problem facing users with these increased television programming options is the possibility for the receipt of multiple versions of essentially the same program from multiple sources. For example, two different sources may be broadcasting the same movie at approximately the same time. Differences may exist between these multiple versions and because of these differences a user may prefer to view one over the other. However, given the large selection of television programming options available to the user, locating such different versions can be difficult. Furthermore, the ability for the user to know which version he or she prefers is often difficult, as these differences are typically not made available to the user."

Claim 1 refers to a method with the following elements:

receiving user preferences for entertainment program characteristics from a user at an electronic device; (*See e.g. page 12, line 22-page 13, line 6*)

storing the received user preferences at the electronic device; (*See e.g. page 12, line 22-page 13, line 6*)

receiving an electronic programming guide at the electronic device; (*See e.g. page 12, lines 9-15*)

receiving a selection of an entertainment program within the electronic programming guide from a user at the electronic device; (*See e.g. page 13, line18*)

identifying multiple available versions of the same selected entertainment program in the electronic programming guide; (*See e.g. page 14, lines 1-2*)

determining whether multiple versions are available; (*See e.g. page 14, lines 14-15*)

identifying, for each of the multiple versions, if multiple versions are available, a plurality of characteristics of each respective version of the same selected entertainment program; (*See e.g. page*)

determining whether automatic program selection has been configured; (*See e.g. page 15, lines 14-15*)

displaying the identified versions if automatic program selection has not been configured; (*See e.g. page 14, line22, page 15, line 7*) and

selecting, by the electronic device, if automatic program selection has been configured, (*See e.g. page 14, line 22*) one of the multiple versions for display by comparing the identified characteristics to the received user preferences for entertainment program characteristics and selecting the program that has the most characteristics conforming to the user preferences. (*See e.g. page 15, lines 13-19*)

Claim 10 is a means plus function claim based on Claim 1 that includes instructions for the following operations:

receiving user preferences for entertainment program characteristics from a user at an electronic device; (*See e.g. page 12, line 22-page 13, line 6*)

storing the received user preferences at the electronic device; (*See e.g. page 12, line 22-page 13, line 6*)

receiving an electronic programming guide at the electronic device; (*See e.g. page 12, lines 9-15*)

receiving a selection of an entertainment program within the electronic programming guide from a user at the electronic device; (*See e.g. page 13, line18*)

identifying multiple available versions of the same selected entertainment program in the electronic programming guide; (*See e.g. page 14, lines 1-2*)

determining whether multiple versions are available; (*See e.g. page 14, lines 14-15*)

identifying, for each of the multiple versions, if multiple versions are available, a plurality of characteristics of each respective version of the same selected entertainment program; (*See e.g. page*)

determining whether automatic program selection has been configured; (*See e.g. page 15, lines 14-15*)

displaying the identified versions if automatic program selection has not been configured; (*See e.g. page 14, line22, page 15, line 7*) and

selecting, by the electronic device, if automatic program selection has been configured, (*See e.g. page 14, line 22*) one of the multiple versions for display by comparing the identified characteristics to the received user preferences for entertainment program characteristics and selecting the program that has the most characteristics conforming to the user preferences. (*See e.g. page 15, lines 13-19*)

Claim 16 is directed to an apparatus with the following elements:

a program guide controller to receive and store an electronic programming guide; (*See e.g. page 12, lines 9-15)*

a user preferences store containing user preferences received from a user for entertainment program characteristics, the user preferences including a configuration for automatic or manual program selection; (*See e.g. page 12, line 22-page 13, line 6; page 13, lines 5-6; page 14, line 22; page 15, lines 14-15*)

a selection controller coupled to the program guide controller to receive a selection of an entertainment program, to identify multiple available versions of the selected entertainment program, to identify, for each of the multiple versions, if multiple versions are available, a plurality of characteristics of each respective version, to determine whether automatic or manual program selection has been configured, to display the identified versions if manual program selection is configured, and to select one of the multiple versions for display, if automatic program selection has been configured, by comparing the identified characteristics to the stored user preferences for entertainment program characteristics and selecting the program that has the most characteristics conforming to the user preferences; (*See e.g. page 12, lines 16-21*) and

a device controller, coupled to the selection controller, to display the selected one of the multiple versions of the entertainment program. (*See e.g. page 12, lines 5-8*)

VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

Claims 1-5, 7, 9-19, and 21-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schein et al., U.S. Patent Application No. 2006/0168620 ("Schein"), in view of Rosser, U.S. Patent No. 6,446,261 ("Rosser") and Ismail et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,614,987 ("Ismail").

While the Examiner did not articulate any specific rejection against Claim 8, nor was it indicated as allowed. Claims 23 and 24 were not indicated as rejected on page 4 of the action, yet reasons for rejection were provided on page 7.

Claim 6 and 20 have previously been canceled

VII. ARGUMENT AGAINST THE REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-5, 7-19 AND 21-26 FOR OBVIOUSNESS

A. Introduction

The prosecution of the application has focused primarily on Claim 1 and, accordingly, only Claim 1 is discussed below. Applicants submit that if Claim 1 is allowable on the grounds discussed below, then all of the claims are allowable.

The Examiner has cited three references in combination to reject the claims. These references and their application are summarized below:

In Schein, the user has a "When Else" key or button (See e.g. Fig. 2, item 48). The system maintains an Electronic Programming Guide (EPG) in memory that allows the user to find listings and descriptions of current and future broadcasts. In the EPG, after selecting a program, the user can select "When Else," and other broadcast times for that same program are displayed (See e.g. Fig. 3). The user can then select to watch, record, etc any of the displayed choices (See e.g. Fig. 4).

The Examiner suggests that these other broadcasts of the same program may be different versions of the program. In other words HBO1 may broadcast a different version of the movie "Gone with the Wind" than does NBC. While it is possible for the broadcasts to differ, such a possibility is nowhere suggested in the reference. Nor does the reference say anything about any effect of such a possibility. There is also no way in Schein for a user or the device to know whether this is true, nor to make any selection on this basis.

Rosser is relied upon to show program selection methodologies and multiple user preferences. Rosser, however, as explained in its abstract, is directed to a system for selecting commercials at the head end. Rosser tracks viewer behavior and maps that to statistics generated through polling to determine user demographics. The demographics are used to select appropriate advertising (called insertable indicia). A closer review of Rosser also reveals that Rosser not only does not suggest multiple versions of a program, it does not even suggest multiple versions of a commercial, but instead different commercials for different products.

The Examiner points to Col. 14, lines 15-23 as showing using user profiles to select a version of a program. Rosser here states that "program producers or broadcasters may themselves wish to use the system of Anonymous Profile targeting to present different versions of programs." It should be noted that there is no clear connection between this use of "Anonymous Profile Targeting" and the "insertable indicia." Rosser does not explain how the broadcaster presents the intended version of the program. In the rest of the description, the program is received on broadcast and then a smaller item ("insertable indicia"), such as subtitles or a commercial is inserted at an appropriate point as determined by data in the VBI (Vertical Blanking Interval). A whole program cannot be inserted using Rosser's system. In addition, the suggestion made by this lone few sentences is inadequate to teach the claimed invention as will be explained below.

Ismail is relied upon to show recording a program based on user preferences. According to its summary, the system monitors viewing history, selects other programs based on this history, and then records them for the viewer to watch later, if desired. This reference has nothing to say about selecting between different versions of a program.

B. The References fail to Show How to Provide the Benefits of the Present Invention.

As an initial matter, Applicants submit that the present invention shows a fundamental difference from the references. The present invention allows the user to select (or have selected) one of several different versions of the same program. Claim 7 lists some of the possible differences. By providing a way to make this decision, the present invention allows a user to significantly increase the value of his entertainment time and investment.

One simple example, is a user who has spent thousands on a 7.1 channel surround sound system with all 8 speakers, 8 channels of power amplification and all the wires and sacrifices to décor necessary. The same movie might be available in stereo from one broadcaster and in full 7.1 channel Dolby True HD from another. The user will obviously want to exploit as much of his investment as possible to maximize the experience. Knowing the source is not enough since cable, satellite and ATSC can all provide anything from black and white, mono 480i to full color, Dolby 5.1, 1080i. There

is no clear way in any of the cited references to determine which version of the program to watch and the difference to the viewer can be great.

Another example, is where one broadcast is included in a paid subscription and the other is pay per view. The present invention easily allows the user to make the most of the services that he has already purchased. In some embodiments, the user can balance, quality and price by comparing features. For a talk show, the less expensive version might do, while for an action movie, higher resolution in audio and sound might be worth the extra money.

C. The References fail to Show the Fundamental Operations as Presented in the Pending Claims.

As recited in Claim 1, there is a particular set of operations in the invention that includes:

"receiving a selection of an entertainment program... from the user." (Schein)

"identifying multiple available versions of the same selected entertainment program." (Schein using the "When Else" button)

"selecting, by the electronic device,... one of the multiple versions for display by comparing the identified characteristics to the received user preferences.. and selecting the program that has the most characteristics conforming to the user preferences." (Rosser)

The parenthetical after each operation indicates which reference the Examiner has applied to these operations. In Schein the user can select a program from the Electronic Programming Guide (EPG) and then hit the "When Else" key. This causes a search for broadcasts with the same name as shown in Schein Figure 3. There is nothing in Schein to suggest that these programs are different versions and Schein provides no insight as to how to handle different versions other than to just list them as if they are all the same.

Accordingly, Schein does not show identifying multiple available versions, nor comparing any identified characteristics that could be used to select one over the other.

In Rosser, there is an EPG, but there is also no identifying multiple versions. Instead there are commercials for different products. There is no suggestion that different versions of a commercial be directed to different people. Rosser only shows that commercials for different products be directed to expected likely buyers of each product.

In Col. 14, lines 15-23, cited by the Examiner, there is no mention that the claimed process be applied. This process involves, *inter alia*, a) receiving a selection b) identifying multiple versions c) determining whether the identified versions are available, d) comparing the characteristics of the version to the user preferences and then e) selecting a version. In the cited section, the viewer profile is used to present the less violent version.

A logical reading of the cited section of Rosser would be that producers or broadcasters use the Anonymous Target profiling system to select a more or less violent version of their shows for each profile. When a household selects the show for viewing, then they receive the one that has been selected for them.

While the Rosser process may involve some operations similar to those claimed, such as making an initial selection, it requires the other operations to be modified in order for the claim to read on it. Identifying, comparing and selecting are done in advance by the producers or broadcasters. Receiving a selection is done on demand at the set-top box, and determining availability is not really done at all. Such a reading is inconsistent with the clear meaning of the claim.

D. The References do not Give Control over Different Versions to the User.

There is yet another aspect of the claim that prevents the application of Rosser in this way. Claim 1, further recites, "selecting by the electronic device..." In Rosser, the set-top box monitors viewing history and everything else is controlled at the head end. The set-top box does not find different commercials and compare them but instead is instructed which commercial to insert and when.

Claim 1 provides the significant benefit of allowing the user to establish his own profile and "if automatic program selection has not been configured" then to even make his own selection about which version to watch.

In order to adapt Schein and Rosser to perform the operations recited in the claims, (1) the channel number functions must be changed to functions on a selected program of the type shown in Schein Fig. 3. (2) The centralized broadcaster functions must be adapted to work on demand in a user electronic device. This would include a) providing information about the versions to the user b) performing a comparison between the versions and the profile, and c) providing access to all of the version so that the user or electronic device can exercise the choice.

Accordingly, the claimed invention, even for these three operations, is not a combination of known operations. There is quite a bit that is missing from both references.

E. The Cited References are Directed to a Different Problem so that it is not Obvious to Apply the Cited References to the Present Invention.

The Examiner would suggest that the three modifications mentioned above would be obvious. Applicants disagree because making the modifications would require some exercise of inventive skill.

There is a fundamental realization for the present invention that has not been made in the prior art. According to the present invention, an "entertainment program" is available in more than one version and the user prefers one version over the other. The present invention is able to determine which version the user prefers and provide that version to the viewer.

Schein has nothing to do with this realization. In Schein, the program is available at another time and Schein lists the other later times. In Rosser, the producers and broadcasters are performing the old function of editing shows for prime-time or for children's hours.

The references do not relate to the issue of giving a viewer the opportunity to make a choice that will best suit his particular needs or desires at the time.

F. The Rejection Ignores Many Additional Limitations in the Claims of the Present Invention

The Examiner relies on Rosser for most of the remaining details of Claim 1, none of which are disclosed in Schein, nor Ismail. Claim 1 differs from Schein and Morrison in all of the features below:

determining whether multiple versions are available,

identifying a plurality of characteristics,

determining whether automatic program selection has been configured,

displaying the identified versions if automatic selection is not configured,

selecting a program if automatic selection is configured,

selecting the program with the most conforming characteristics.

Rosser is directed to selecting among commercials for different items, not for multiple available versions of a commercial. Targeted commercials have been and remain a matter of great interest and this interest is reflected in direct mail advertising, the selection of types of ads based on the type of programs, type of magazine, section of newspaper etc. Applicants submit that there has been no such level of interest in targeted programming.

While the Examiner has found two sentences that suggest the profiling can be applied to programs, the proposed application is controlled by broadcasters, performed at the head end and relates simply to sending a cleaned up version to households with kids.

The present invention is not simply an approach to choosing between a game, a sitcom, the news or a movie, nor is it an approach to choosing between different sitcoms, nor is it a way for broadcasters to self-regulate sex and violence on TV. Similarly, it is not an approach to choosing between a car, dishwashing soap, airline travel or clothing as in Rosser. It is also not an approach to choosing between an economy car commercial and a luxury car commercial. The present invention relates to " multiple available

versions of [one] entertainment program." Rosser treats all ads for a single product as identical. The present invention recognizes that the assumption that things are identical may no longer be valid. It also puts the power to choose firmly within the control of the viewer. If the viewer wants a cleaned up version late at night, that can be selected. If the viewer wants the full measure of sex and violence on Sunday morning that can be chosen as well.

Fundamentally, the problem of selecting between multiple available versions of a single entertainment program is a different problem from selecting between different programs, or more accurately different commercials. The references do not suggest an approach to selecting between different programs, except to let the broadcasters present shows as they feel appropriate.

The claims of the present application are directed to operations at the receiver for selecting programs. Applicants respectfully submit that even if Applicants had taken Rosser and moved it into a home receiver and then adapted it for user configurable program selection, then this, in and of itself, would be inventive. Rosser relies on user selections of programs to determine which products to advertise. Automating program selection is suggested, but Rosser makes no effort to allow users to control this process. This is to be expected. The history of broadcasting regulation is to protect people from objectionable programming whether they like it or now. The level of sex and violence in the morning is different from the first two hours of prime-time which is different than in the last hour of prime-time, which is different than late at night. The user is not informed about the options and given no choice. It would not be obvious to adapt Rosser to user control in a local box, a purpose so remote from its original intention.

None of the three references suggests making a selection of one of the programs by locally comparing multiple characteristics for the programs to user preferences. In Schein, the user makes the choice based on broadcast time. In Rosser, different commercials are being chosen at the head end. In Ismail, again there are no different versions.

G. Closing

Only with the advent of new programming sources and the myriad formats offered by digital television has the selection of multiple available versions of an entertainment program become significant. Many big screen TV households now have the option of watching Monday Night Football as an NTSC (National Television System Committee) version on an analog terrestrial or cable channel, as a digital SD (standard definition) version on a terrestrial, cable, or satellite channel, or as a digital HD (high definition) version on a cable, DBS, or digital terrestrial broadcast channel. In addition to different levels of definition, there may be different amounts of compression for the same definition and different levels of audio support. All of these channels may carry the same game and the same sportscasters, but the video and audio formats and compression rates may be very different for each one. Finding the choices is one matter, selecting one of the choices is another. The problem of making such a selection is simply not contemplated by the references. Note how there is nothing in the profiles of Rosser that could even be used for such a selection.

VIII. CONCLUSION

Appellant respectfully submits that all appealed claims in this application are patentable and were improperly rejected by the Examiner during prosecution before the United States Patent and Trademark Office. Appellant respectfully requests that the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences overrule the Examiner and direct allowance of the rejected claims.

This Brief is submitted with a check for $510.00 to cover the appeal fee for one other than a small entity as specified in 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(c). Please charge any shortages and credit any overpayments to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: October 2, 2008

Gordon R. Lindeen III
Reg. No. 33,192

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA. 94085
(303) 740-1980

The PTO did not receive the following listed Item(s) CK # $510.00

OIPE IAP93
OCT 06 2008
PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IX. APPENDIX OF CLAIMS (37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(viii))

1. A method comprising:

receiving user preferences for entertainment program characteristics from a user at an electronic device;

storing the received user preferences at the electronic device;

receiving an electronic programming guide at the electronic device;

receiving a selection of an entertainment program within the electronic programming guide from a user at the electronic device;

identifying multiple available versions of the same selected entertainment program in the electronic programming guide;

determining whether multiple versions are available;

identifying, for each of the multiple versions, if multiple versions are available, a plurality of characteristics of each respective version of the same selected entertainment program;

determining whether automatic program selection has been configured;

displaying the identified versions if automatic program selection has not been configured; and

selecting, by the electronic device, if automatic program selection has been configured, one of the multiple versions for display by comparing the identified characteristics to the received user preferences for entertainment program characteristics and selecting the program that has the most characteristics conforming to the user preferences.

2. The method of claim 1, wherein identifying comprises identifying multiple versions of the entertainment program that start within a threshold period of time of one another.

3. The method of claim 1, wherein at least some of the multiple versions are provided on different transport media, the method further comprising:

identifying, for each of the one or more different channel transport media, a set of descriptive information regarding the channel transport medium; and

wherein selecting comprises selecting one of the multiple versions for display based on the sets of channel transport medium descriptive information.

4. The method of claim 1, wherein identifying multiple versions comprises identifying alternate versions of the selected entertainment program that all start at approximately the same time.

5. The method of claim 1, wherein selecting comprises selecting the one of the multiple versions having the identified characteristics most closely resembling the user preferences for entertainment program characteristics.

6. (Canceled)

7. The method of claim 1, wherein the identified characteristics for each of the multiple versions includes one or more of channel transport medium, duration of the version, type of audio support for the version, availability of enhanced programming for the version, language of subtitles in the version, language spoken in the version, screen format of the version, and color code of the version.

8. The method of claim 1, further comprising:

identifying a user of an entertainment system;

accessing user preferences for the identified user;

and wherein selecting comprises selecting the one of the multiple versions for display based on a comparison of the identified characteristics to the accessed user preferences.

9. The method of claim 1, wherein identifying multiple versions comprises identifying multiple versions in the electronic programming guide.

10. A storage medium having stored thereon a plurality of instructions that, when executed by a processor, result in:

receiving user preferences for entertainment program characteristics from a user at an electronic device;

storing the received user preferences at the electronic device;

receiving an electronic programming guide at the electronic device receiving a selection of an entertainment program within the electronic programming guide from a user at the electronic device;

identifying multiple available versions of the same selected entertainment program in the electronic programming guide;

determining whether multiple versions are available;

identifying, for each of the multiple versions, if multiple versions are available, a plurality of characteristics of each respective version of the same selected entertainment program;

determining whether automatic program selection has been configured;

displaying the identified versions if automatic program selection has not been

configured; and

selecting, by the electronic device, if automatic program selection has been configured, one of the multiple versions for display by comparing the identified characteristics to the received user preferences for entertainment program characteristics and selecting the program that has the most characteristics conforming to the user preferences.

11. The storage medium of claim 10, wherein the plurality of instructions, when executed by the processor, further result in identifying multiple versions of the entertainment program that start within a threshold period of time of one another.

12. The storage medium of claim 10, wherein at least some of the multiple versions are provided on different transport media, wherein the plurality of instructions, when executed by the processor, further result in:

identifying, for each of the one or more different channel transport media, a set of descriptive information regarding the channel transport medium; and

selecting one of the multiple versions for display based on the sets of channel transport medium descriptive information.

13. The storage medium of claim 10, wherein the plurality of instructions, when executed by the processor, further result in identifying alternate versions of the selected entertainment program that all start at approximately the same time.

14. The storage medium of claim 10, wherein the plurality of instructions, when executed by the processor, further result in selecting the one of the multiple versions of the entertainment program having the identified characteristics most closely resembling the set of user preferences.

15. The storage medium of claim 10, wherein the identified characteristics for each of the multiple versions includes one or more of channel transport medium, duration of the version, type of audio support for the version, availability of enhanced programming for the version, language of subtitles in the version, language spoken in the version, screen format of the version, and color code of the version.

16. An apparatus comprising:

a program guide controller to receive and store an electronic programming guide;

a user preferences store containing user preferences received from a user for entertainment program characteristics, the user preferences including a configuration for automatic or manual program selection;

a selection controller coupled to the program guide controller to receive a selection of an entertainment program, to identify multiple available versions of the selected entertainment program, to identify, for each of the multiple versions, if multiple versions are available, a plurality of characteristics of each respective version, to determine whether automatic or manual program selection has been configured, to display the identified versions if manual program selection is configured, and to select one of the multiple versions for display, if automatic program selection has been configured, by comparing the identified characteristics to the stored user preferences for entertainment program characteristics and selecting the program that has the most characteristics conforming to the user preferences; and

a device controller, coupled to the selection controller, to display the selected one of the multiple versions of the entertainment program.

17. The apparatus of claim 16, wherein the selection controller is also to identify multiple versions of the entertainment program that start within a threshold period of time of one another.

18. The apparatus of claim 16, wherein at least some of the multiple versions are provided on different transport media and wherein the selection controller is further to:

identify, for each of the one or more different channel transport media, a set of descriptive information regarding the channel transport medium; and

choose one of the multiple versions for display based on the sets of descriptive information.

19. The apparatus of claim 16, wherein in selecting one of the multiple versions for display, the selection controller is to select the one of the multiple versions of the entertainment program having the characteristics most closely resembling the set of user preferences.

20. (Canceled)

21. The apparatus of claim 16, wherein the characteristics for each of the multiple versions includes one or more of duration of the version, type of audio support for the version, availability of enhanced programming for the version, language of subtitles in the version, language spoken in the version, screen format of the version, and color code of the version.

22. The method of claim 1, further comprising determining the user preferences by receiving preference information through manual inputs from a user.

23. The method of claim 1, further comprising determining the user preferences by monitoring the viewing behavior of a user.

24. The method of claim 1, further comprising identifying a particular user and applying user preferences for the identified user.

25. The apparatus of claim 16, further comprising a user interface controller to receive user preferences through manual information inputs from a user.

26. The apparatus of claim 16, further comprising user preferences to monitor the viewing behavior of a user and determine the user preferences thereby.

X. EVIDENCE APPENDIX

None.

XI. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

None.